



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/592,926	04/18/2008	Sophie Deroo	60838.000630	5791

21967 7590 07/15/2010
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

SASTRI, SATYA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/15/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/592,926	Applicant(s) DEROO ET AL.	
	Examiner SATYA B. SASTRI	Art Unit 1796	

All Participants:

Status of Application: 120

(1) SATYA B. SASTRI.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Robert Schulman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2010

Time: 12.30 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

14, 18

Prior art documents discussed:

Crooks et al. (US6,638,994 B2)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Satya B Sastri/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney was contacted to discuss the amendment dated 7/6/10 in view of newly found art to Crooks et al. It was noted that the prior art teaches the block copolymer and water insoluble (hydrophilic) active ingredient in amounts that meet the compositional requirements as presently recited in claim 14. Further, it was noted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest a hydrophobic phase comprising silicones, fragrances, organic, mineral or vegetable oils or mixtures thereof, as presently recited in claim 18 and thus, amendment by incorporating limitations of claim 18 into claim 14 was suggested to potentially place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's attorney indicated that the examiner would be contacted after 24h following consultation with the client.